

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: LEFEBVRE, Michel

SERIAL NO.: 10/524728

ART UNIT: 2176

FILED: 16 February 2005

EXAMINER: Debrow, J. J.

TITLE: METHOD FOR COMMUNICATING STRUCTURED INFORMATION

Amendment A: REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendments, Claims 1-12 remain in this case. All claims have been amended in response to the Office Action. Reconsideration of the rejections, in light of the forgoing amendments and present remarks, is respectfully requested. The present amendments have been entered for the purpose of distinguishing the present invention from the prior art.

In the Office Action, it was indicated that Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the McCaskey publication in view of the Dedrick patent. Claims 5-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the McCaskey publication in view of the Dedrick patent and further in view of the Miyasaka patent. The Claims were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention. The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for failing to show a step of the invention and repetitive reference numerals. The Abstract was objected to for failing to have proper claim language.

It is important to note that the Examiner has considered the incorrect set of claims. Applicant's attorney attempted to provide an easy format for the processing by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, but difficulties remain. The set of claims (Claim 1-12) for consideration were presented in the substitute specification on February 16, 2005. These claims were the current

pending set of claims from the most recent amendments to the International PCT Application under Article 19. These claims were amended in the Preliminary Amendment concurrently filed on February 16, 2005. The abstract amendments were also not considered by the Examiner.

Another set of claims (Claims 1-10) was submitted on July 29, 2005 in response to the Notification of Missing Requirements. These claims (Claims 1-10) were only submitted for completion of requirements under 35 U.S.C. §371 as a formality of the translation of the original PCT document. However, these claims (Claims 1-10) were no good because they were already superseded by the Article 19 amendments. The translation was provided to complete the filing requirements, but these claims (1-10) were not supposed to be considered for examination. The format of these claims (1-10) was completely improper for U.S. standards, including multiple dependencies and reference numerals.

Applicant's attorney had already resolved all of these informalities for the Examiner's convenience in the Preliminary Amendment of February 16, 2005. Claims 1-12 are pending. In response to the rejections, Applicant has extensively amended Claims 1-12. These claims are not identical to the old set of claims (Claims 1-10) considered by the Examiner, but these claims are similar. The substance and nature of the rejections have considered in the claim amendments presented.

The invention relates to a method for the communication of structured, coded, textually dominant information between at least one first user producing this information and at least one second user receiving this information within the context of a collaborative work. Structured information is also exchanged, such as activity reports. The first user and second users may be part of the same company organization.

The reports or statements are costly to produce because an editor spends a great deal of time on presentation, sorting and arranging so that information is useful and pertinent both the first user and second users. The relative slowness of production and transmission of the reports therefore impairs the speed of the company and inhibits efficiency. A further difficulty arises when the report is intended for several recipients who each have their own requirements and their own priorities in terms of project management. Alternatively, a comprehensive report poses the risk of information overload to second users.

The purpose of the present invention to solve the problems relating to speed of production and supply of information. Quality and legibility of the information transmitted between the users will also be improved. The method also addresses presentation of identical content to several users using adaptations to individual requirements without the risk of truncated or incomplete data.

As such Claims 1 and 12 have been amended to specifically recite the step of defining the document standard by both the first user and second users. Such a step is not found in any of the prior art documents cited by the Examiner. The end user of the prior art only receives part of the information, which the supplier of the information can issue. The end user does not participate with the producer of the information in establishing a document standard, being related only to an information supplier instead of an information producer.

The McCaskey publication relates to methods for publishing press articles and images on the Web to produce an electronic newspaper. The recipient of the information does not participate with the journalist (the information producer) in the establishment of a document standard. The disclosure of the customized web presentation is not the claim of the present invention because the standardization between terminals is not disclosed. Additionally, the Dedrick patent relates to a

method and a device for the dynamic personalization of information for end users, namely consumers, so that this information is selected and can be adapted to their requirements and their particular characteristics. However, the end user still does not collaborate with the information producer to establish a document standard. The formation of an individual "user profile" of the Dedrick patent is not the collaboration now claimed by the present invention. The end user is still subject to control by the information producer, i.e. publicity emails. In combination, these prior art references fail to disclose the subject matter of Claims 1 and 12 as now presented.

The Miyasaka patent relates to a computer network suitable for supplying a personalized newspaper to a recipient according to the particular preferences of a user profile. Again, collaboration between the information producer and the recipient of the information is not found in this patent. The newspaper forces the recipient to receive information as dictated by the newspaper, which fails the corporate model of the present invention. The collaborative work and group projects are not taught by the addition of the Miyasaka patent to the previous combination of the McCaskey publication and the Dedrick patent.

Moreover, the prior art combinations fail to disclose any input of the information producer towards the document standard. For example, the journalist cannot control the input format of the story information. All of the information is already de-customized and dispersed, without any mutual relationship and, by extension, without relationship to the same collaborative project. The system cannot be adjusted to the efficiency and cross-referencing capabilities to enable project management in a corporate setting.

As such, the direct relationship between the first user and each second user is now recited in the independent claims of the present invention. This feature is not disclosed by the prior art

combinations. Additionally, formality changes have been entered for all claims so as to improve compliance with U.S. standards and to increase the ease of comprehension of the claim language. Awkward translations have been resolved, and no new matter is presented in these amendments.

The drawings have been amended to correct the typographical error of "800" and "802".

The abstract has been amended. The corrections of the Preliminary Amendment of February 16, 2005 have been re-presented in the present amendment.

On this basis, Applicant contends that independent Claims 1 and 12 are now in proper condition for allowance. Additionally, those claims which are dependent upon these independent claims should also be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the claims at an early date is earnestly solicited. Since no new claims have been added above those originally paid for, no additional fee is required. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claim language for allowance.

A Petition for Extension of Time and requisite fee are submitted concurrent with the present amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

March 24, 2008

Date

Customer No. 24106

/Andrew W. Chu/

John S. Egbert; Reg. No. 30,627  
Andrew W. Chu; Reg. No. 46,625  
Egbert Law Offices PLLC  
412 Main Street, 7th Floor  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(713)224-8080  
(713)223-4873 fax